

Citizens' Unit to Monitor F.B.I. Urged

By **ROBERT M. SMITH**

Special to The New York Times

PRINCETON, N.J., Oct. 29—

A Yale Law School professor opened a two-day conference on the Federal Bureau of Investigation here today by calling for the creation of a board of private citizens to monitor the work of the F.B.I.

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, who specializes in free speech, free press and other First Amendment issues, also suggested the creation of an ombudsman post with authority to receive and investigate citizen's complaints about the bureau.

Professor Emerson made his proposals to a group of about 40 lawyers, scholars and journalists meeting here under auspices of the Woodrow Wilson School of Princeton University and the Committee for Public Justice.

The committee was formed a year ago as an organization of private citizens concerned that the nation had entered "a period of political repression."

The conference chairmen are Duane Lockard, chairman of the Princeton politics department; Norman Dorsen, professor at New York University Law School, and Burke, Marshall, deputy dean of Yale Law Scho

Hoover Declines Invitation

They invited J. Edgar Hoover, the bureau's director, to come to the conference or send a representative, but he declined, contending that the participants were prejudiced against the F.B.I.

"I recalled with some amusement," Mr. Hoover wrote Dr. Lockard, "the story of the frontier judge who said he would first give the defendant a fair trial and then hang him."

At today's session a wide-ranging series of complaints were directed at the F.B.I. Participants said the conference was virtually the first attempt to delve into the affairs of the bureau in an organized way and that it was taking place at a time of increasing public criticism of the bureau.

There seemed to be only two participants who regularly defended Mr. Hoover and his agency; they were both from an organization called Americans for Effective Law.

The critical examination of the F.B.I. ranged from the bureau's political surveillance

to its budget, from the training of agents to its public relations.

A Critic of Analysis

Professor Emerson presented the following point of view: "The bureau has visualized itself as the main bulwark of our national security. It is concerned not only with the possibility of espionage and the threat of violence but goes into two other spheres.

"One is the sphere of loyalty, the other of subversive activity.

"The result is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation conceives of itself as an instrument to prevent radical social change in America. This has led the bureau into what might be called warfare against dissident groups. It directs its interests and attention to all people who are outside the two major political parties."

He suggested that the bureau be enjoined from actions like photographing peaceful demonstrators in "compiling political dossiers on people not charged with a crime or reasonably suspected of a violation of the law."

Richard Wright, the associate executive director of Ameri-

cans for Effective Law Enforcement, said he thought "the F.B.I. has a basic duty to make sure the radicals don't get away with intimidating the rest of us" and asked whether surveillance of some political groups was not justified if they were involved in violence.

How to Draw Line

Professor Emerson conceded that this was "the key question" and said it would be "a major step forward if we could

draw that line" between general intelligence-gathering and legitimate surveillance.

Frank J. Donner, a lawyer who is director of a political surveillance project being carried out by the American Civil Liberties Union, argued that "the informer should be understood as a means of perpetuating the myth that the government is under threat of perpetual subversion." He continued:

No continuation